



This is a digital copy of a book that was preserved for generations on library shelves before it was carefully scanned by Google as part of a project to make the world's books discoverable online.

It has survived long enough for the copyright to expire and the book to enter the public domain. A public domain book is one that was never subject to copyright or whose legal copyright term has expired. Whether a book is in the public domain may vary country to country. Public domain books are our gateways to the past, representing a wealth of history, culture and knowledge that's often difficult to discover.

Marks, notations and other marginalia present in the original volume will appear in this file - a reminder of this book's long journey from the publisher to a library and finally to you.

### Usage guidelines

Google is proud to partner with libraries to digitize public domain materials and make them widely accessible. Public domain books belong to the public and we are merely their custodians. Nevertheless, this work is expensive, so in order to keep providing this resource, we have taken steps to prevent abuse by commercial parties, including placing technical restrictions on automated querying.

We also ask that you:

- + *Make non-commercial use of the files* We designed Google Book Search for use by individuals, and we request that you use these files for personal, non-commercial purposes.
- + *Refrain from automated querying* Do not send automated queries of any sort to Google's system: If you are conducting research on machine translation, optical character recognition or other areas where access to a large amount of text is helpful, please contact us. We encourage the use of public domain materials for these purposes and may be able to help.
- + *Maintain attribution* The Google "watermark" you see on each file is essential for informing people about this project and helping them find additional materials through Google Book Search. Please do not remove it.
- + *Keep it legal* Whatever your use, remember that you are responsible for ensuring that what you are doing is legal. Do not assume that just because we believe a book is in the public domain for users in the United States, that the work is also in the public domain for users in other countries. Whether a book is still in copyright varies from country to country, and we can't offer guidance on whether any specific use of any specific book is allowed. Please do not assume that a book's appearance in Google Book Search means it can be used in any manner anywhere in the world. Copyright infringement liability can be quite severe.

### About Google Book Search

Google's mission is to organize the world's information and to make it universally accessible and useful. Google Book Search helps readers discover the world's books while helping authors and publishers reach new audiences. You can search through the full text of this book on the web at <http://books.google.com/>

# Three new edicts of Aśoka

Georg Bühler,  
Aśoka (King of  
Magadha)

20 B 39

43a  
41B29



L.,









## THREE NEW EDICTS OF AŚOKA.

---

The subjoined three edicts form part of the splendid discoveries which General Cunningham has been making in Northern and Central India during the last years, and will shortly be published in facsimiles in the first volume of his *Corpus Inscriptionum Indicarum*. General Cunningham sent me last autumn plate XIV. of his work which contains them. With the help of a photograph also furnished by him I soon succeeded in deciphering the very simple Sahasrām edict. But the more important Rûpnâth inscription I was unable to make out completely until I received two rubbings, which General Cunningham was good enough to take at my request. On my communicating my final results he very generously gave me permission to publish the text with my translations, and thus enabled me to make these most important inscriptions at once generally accessible.

The great historical value of the new edicts lies herein :—

1stly—That they absolutely fix the length of time which elapsed between Buddha's *nirvāṇa* and Aśoka ;



2ndly—That they prove the accuracy of the chronology of the southern Buddhists, *as far as India is concerned* ;

3rdly—That their data, together with the information of the Greek historians, prove Buddha's *nirvāṇa* to have taken place between the years 483-82 and 472-71 B.C. ; and

4thly—That they indicate the direction in which future efforts to find the exact date of Buddha's *nirvāṇa* ought to be made.

These assertions may appear bold and overconfident, as the inscriptions neither give the name of the king who caused them to be incised, nor show any of the common epithets of Buddha. But nevertheless I feel confident that a careful consideration of the contents of the edicts will cause their correctness to be admitted.

In the Sahasrām inscription a person who calls himself 'the Beloved of the gods' states that he was for a long time an *upāsaka*, or worshipper, without exerting himself much for his faith ; that afterwards, in consequence of strenuous exertion *during a year and more*, he made the inhabitants of Jambudvīpa, *i.e.* India, abjure the gods in whom they believed formerly. He then quotes a passage in favour of 'exertion' from a 'sermon,' and adds that this sermon was delivered by the *Vivutha*, 'the Departed,' two hundred and fifty-six (years) before, and that its substance has been incised on rocks and stone pillars. In the Rûpnâth edict 'the Beloved of the gods' enlarges

the first two statements by adding that the time of his being an *upāsaka* included *more than thirty-two years and a half*; and that during the period of exertion, lasting *upwards of a year*, he was a member of the *saṅgha*, or of the community of ascetics. This last point is also preserved in the fragment of the Bairāt inscription. In the date the Rūpnāth edict shows, besides, an important addition. It says, '256 (years) from the departure of the *Sata*, the Teacher.'

Now it is quite clear that the individual who calls himself 'the Beloved of the gods' must be a *king*. For, the fact that this epithet occurs before the names of the three kings Piyaḍasi-Aśoka, Daśaratha, and Tishya, and that in the Jaugada separate edicts it is used by itself to denote the first ruler, proves that it was an ancient royal title corresponding nearly to the modern 'by the grace of God,' and the Roman Augustus, and was used in the third century before Christ. Secondly, the boast that the writer caused a change of religion throughout India,—the result not of his *greatness*, but of his *zeal*,—and that he caused the matter of the sermon to be incised on rocks and pillars, can only proceed from a great ruler, who held, the whole or a great part of India in subjection. Both the title of the writer, and the alphabet which the edicts show, make it very probable that this king belongs to the third century before Christ, and to the Maurya dynasty.

For it has hitherto not been proved that the title was used by later kings, or that the so-called Áśoka or Lâṭ characters were adopted by any one but the Mauryas, their subjects and contemporaries.

The next point to be determined is the faith to which the writer belonged. The statements that he destroyed the belief in the gods until then considered to be true, and that he was first an *upāsaka* or *sāvaka*, and later a member of the *saṅgha*, show that he must have been either a Bauddha or a Jaina. Both these sects apply the former two terms to their lay brethren, and the latter to the brotherhood of their ascetics. If thus the choice lies between the Jainas and Bauddhas, it cannot be doubtful that the latter are meant. For though the Jainas existed in the third century before Christ, and even occur in Piyadasi-Áśoka's inscriptions under their ancient name Nigaṇṭha, *i.e.* Nirgrantha,\* no proof has hitherto been found for their own assertion that they were patronized by one of the Maurya kings;† on the contrary, there is every reason for adhering to the generally received opinion that both Áśoka and his grandson Daśaratha, and the other later Maurya princes, were Buddhists or patrons of Buddhism.

---

\* See Lassen, *Ind. Alt.* vol. II. p. 468., 2nd ed., and Delhi separate edict, l. 5.

† According to their accounts, Samprati or Sampadi, the son of Kuṇḍala and grandson of Áśoka, covered the earth with Jaina *chaityas*. See, *e.g.*, Hemachandra, *Parīśiṣṭaparva*, Sargas X., XI.

If the 'Beloved of the gods' was a Buddhist, it follows that the *sermon* which he quotes, must be a Buddhist sermon, and the *Vivutha* of the Sahasrâm edict, or *Vyutha* of the Rûp-nâth edict, must be the Buddha himself. The word is not one of the common names of Śâkya-muni-Gotama, but its etymological import is such as to make it a fitting epithet for him. I take *vivutha* for a representative of Sanskrit *vivṛitta*, and of Pali *vivutta* or *vivatto*. As not one of these or of the formerly published inscriptions Piyadasi shows double letters, but always substitutes single ones,† *vivutha* is in reality equivalent to *vivuttha*, and this form differs from the Pali *vivutta* only by the aspiration of the second *t*. This difference, however, does not matter much. For, firstly, there are other instances of irregular aspirates in the language of the edicts. Thus we have *kichhi*, 'something,' for Sanskrit *kinchit* and Pali *kinchi*.§ Secondly, the letter *r* causes in Pali sometimes the aspiration of a preceding *ta*, e.g. in *tattha* = *tatra*,|| and it is therefore not astonishing that the vowel *ri* should have exercised the same influence in a cognate dialect.

But irrespective of these phonetic considera-

---

† Compare, e. g., 'diyadhiyam' with Pali *diyaddho*, *tata* with Pali *tattha*, *atthe* with Pali *attho*, etc.

§ Compare also the irregular aspirates in Pali words, like *kuntha*, *phalita*, &c. enumerated by E. Kuhn, *Beiträge zur Pali Grammatik*, p. 40.

|| Compare Kuhn, *loc. cit.* p. 50.

tions the identity of *vivutha* with Sanskrit *vivṛitta* becomes almost certain from the immediately following sentence of the Sahasrām edict, *duve sapaṇṇālātisatā vivuthā*,—literally ‘two hundred (*years*) exceeded by fifty-six have *elapsed*.’ The sense of this passage, which is further confirmed by the phrase of the Khandagiri inscription (line 5) ¶ *tathovivuthe vase*, ‘then after a year had elapsed,’ makes it impossible to take *vivuthā* for anything else than *vi-vṛittāni* or rather *vivṛitte* (nom. dual neuter). As these two examples, as well as the etymology, show, *vivutha*, if applied to a person, means originally ‘the *Departed*,’ or ‘*he who has passed away*.’\* Such a name fits Śākyamuni very well, as he is considered to be the first who passed away *beyond the circle of births*. The Rūpnāth form *vyuṭha* arose, in my opinion, from the substitution of *u* for *vu*, and the consequent change of the *i* of the prefix *vi* to *y* in accordance with the laws of Sanskrit phonetics. Its lingual *th* has been caused by the lost *ri*, which in Pali too, as the form *vaṭṭo* shows, has the same effect.†

From the identification of the *Vivutha*, the preacher of the sermon, with Śākyamuni, it

¶ *Jour. As. Soc. Beng.* vol. VI. p. 1090.

\* Another possibility to explain *vivutha* as a corruption of *vivṛita*, and to take this as a synonym of *nirvṛita*, Pali *nibbuto*, I reject on account of the two cases where it is construed with the word *vaso*, ‘a year.’

† Compare also E. Kuhn, *loc. cit.* p. 49, and the form *kaṭe* for *kṛitah*.

follows further that the era in which the inscriptions are dated is that of the *Nirvāṇa*. For, the *ti*, i.e. *iti*, which stands at the end of the sentence *duve sapaṇṇūlātisutā vivuthā ti*, shows that it is governed by the preceding sentence, *iyaṇṇ sāvane vivuthena*. Anybody who is acquainted with the use of the Sanskrit *iti* will see the truth of this remark, and will translate *idaṇṇ sāvānaṇ vivṛittena* (*kṛitam*) *dve śaṭpañchāsādhikaśate vivṛitte iti*, by "this sermon was preached by the *Departed* two hundred and fifty-six years ago." The date of the Rûpnāth inscription confirms the above explanation. It says, 256 *sata-vivāsā ta* (i. e. *ti*), lit. "256 from the departure of the *Sata*, thus." Here the word *sata* requires special notice. It may stand for Sanskrit *śata*, 100, or, as the inscription does not note double consonants for *saptan*, 'seven,' *śikta*, 'able,' *śapta*, 'cursed;' or, as the inscription frequently leaves out the *anusvāra*†, for *santa*, i.e. *sat*, pres. part. of *as*, 'good,' *śānta*, 'quiescent,' *śrānta*, 'tired;' or, finally, because the inscriptions do not always aspirate *t* followed by *r* or preceded by *s*, § for *śasta*, 'praised,' *śastra*, 'a weapon,' *śāstra*, 'institutes of science,' and *śāstri*, 'a teacher.' I select from these numerous possibilities the last explanation, because in Pali *satthu*|| = Sanskrit *śāstri* is a common designation of Śākyas.

† Compare, e.g., *pakate* = *prakrāntaḥ*, *atā* = *āntāt*, &c.

§ Compare *tata*, *Sah.* l. 8 = *tatra* and Pali *atta* = *asta* : Kuhn, *loc. cit.* p. 53. || *Vide Childers' Pali Dict.* s. v.

m u n i. The translation of the date is therefore, "256 (*years*) since the departure of the *Teacher* (have elapsed)." The final *ta*, which I believe to represent *tī*, indicates here probably that the inscription is finished.

The result which has now been gained is that the inscriptions proceeded from a Maurya king, or from a contemporary of the Mauryas, who was a Buddhist lay-brother during thirty-two years and a half, and a member of the *saṅgha* for upwards of a year, *i. e.* who was a Buddhist for more than thirty-three and a half, and that in the thirty-fourth year of his adherence to the Buddhist faith 256 years after the *Nirvāṇa* had elapsed, or in other words the 257th year after the *Nirvāṇa* corresponded to the second half of the 34th year after his conversion. Now we know of no Indian princes who made any great efforts for Buddhism in the third century after the *Nirvāṇa* besides Aśoka and Daśaratha, his grandson. But the latter cannot be the author of the inscriptions, as he reigned only seven years. There remains, therefore, nobody but Aśoka, whose reign lasted more than thirty-seven years. This inference is fully confirmed by the *Mahāvamśa*, which, provided a certain line of interpretation is adopted, gives the years of Aśoka's reign after his conversion as upwards of 34, and places his death in 257 Buddhæ.

The chronological dates regarding Aśoka

which occur in the Ceylonese chronicle are as follows :—

1. Interval between Bindusâra's death and Aśoka's *abhisheka*. . . . . (upwards of) 4 years.¶

2. Interval between Aśoka's *abhisheka* and his *conversion* to Buddhism. . . . . (upwards of) 3 years.\*

3. Conversion of Tishya, the *Uparâja* . . . . . in the 4th year of Aśoka's reign.†

4. Ordination of Mahendra and Sanghamitrâ. . . . . in the 6th year.‡

5. Death of the Sthaviras Tishya and Sumanas. . . . . in the 8th year.

6. The third Buddhist convocation . . . . . in the 17th year.§

7. Planting of the Bodhi-tree in Ceylon. . . . . in the 18th year.

8. Death of queen Asandhimitrâ. . . . . 12th year after the last event.

9. Aśoka's marriage with her attendant. . . . . 4th year after the last event.

10. Destruction of the Bodhi-tree. . . . . 3rd year after the last event.

¶ *Mahāvamśa*, V. 17-20,—Turnour, pp. 21-22.

\* *Mahāv.* V. 35,—Turnour, p. 23. In this passage and the preceding one the author says that *three* and *four* years respectively had elapsed when the second event took place; the latter fell, therefore, in the 4th and 5th years. Mr. Turnour translates *chatuhi vassehi* (V. 20) wrongly by 'in the fourth year.'

† *Mahāv.* V. 169-172,—Turnour, p. 34.

‡ *Mahāv.* V. 215,—Turnour, p. 37.

§ *Mahāv.* V. 286,—Turnour, p. 42.



11. Death of Aśoka. . . . . 4th year  
after the last event.

12. Total of Aśoka's reign . . . . 37 years.||

There are two points connected with these dates which require consideration, viz. if the years of Aśoka mentioned under Nos. 3-7 are to be counted from the death of Bindusâra or from Aśoka's *abhisheka*, and, secondly, how the dates under 8-11 can be reconciled with the statement No. 12, that Aśoka ruled 37 years.

As regards the first question, the common custom of the Hindus to reckon the years of their kings from the date of their *abhisheka*, and not from their actual accession to the throne, is a strong argument for taking all the years mentioned under Nos. 3-7, as well as the total under No. 12, to refer to the period after Aśoka's *abhisheka*. This argument is further strengthened by the consideration that if the 4th year, in which Aśoka's brother Tishya entered the *sangha*, and the 6th year, in which his (Aśoka's) son Mahendra and his daughter Sanghamitrâ were ordained, had to be counted from Bindusâra's death, both these events would fall *before* Aśoka's *conversion to Buddhism*. For his conversion cannot have taken place earlier than the 8th year after Bindusâra's death. Now Indian princes were, and are, no doubt, great latitudinarians in religious matters, and it would not be extra-

---

|| For the last dates see *Mahāv. XX. 1.6*,—Turnour, p. 122.

ordinary to find that the brother of a Brahmanical king had turned Buddhist with his sanction. But it seems extremely improbable that a Brahman should persuade, or even give permission to, a son and a daughter to become ascetics of another sect than his own. For this reason also I can come to no other conclusion but that the dates of Tishya's and of Mahendra's and Sanghamitrâ's ordinations fall in the 4th and 6th years after Ásoka's *abhisheka*, i.e. in the 1st and 3rd years after his conversion. If that is conceded in the case of these two events, it follows that all the other dates have to be taken in the same manner. The second question—as to how the dates given under 8-11 are to be reconciled with the statement under 12, that Ásoka reigned 37 years—has attracted the attention of Professor Lassen, who is of opinion that the *Mahāvamśa* contradicts itself. He maintains that as the death of Asandhimitrâ fell in the 12th year after the 18th year of Ásoka's accession, the marriage of Ásoka in the 4th year after that event, the destruction of the Bodhi-tree in the 3rd year after the marriage, and the death of Ásoka in the 3rd year after the destruction of the Bodhi-tree, the total of Ásoka's years ought to be 41, instead of 37.¶ The *Mahāvamśa* certainly does express itself very loosely, but

---

¶ Lassen, *Ind. Alt.* vol. I. p. 283, 2nd ed. He has overlooked the fact that the *Tikā* of the *Mahāvamśa*—Turnour, *Introd.* p. xlvii.—warns against this 'laughable mistake.'

still its statements may be reconciled with each other. For it does not assert that the last four events took place at intervals of 12, 4, 3, and 4 years, but at intervals of

11 years +  $x$  months or days.

3 years +  $x$  „ „

2 years +  $x$  „ „

3 years +  $x$  „ „

Nor does it say that the Bodhi-tree was sent to Ceylon 18 years after Aśoka's *abhisheka*, but in the 18th year, *i.e.* after 17 years and  $x$  months or days had elapsed. If we now assume that the number of the months or days in excess of the full years elapsed on the occurrence of each of the last five events does amount to more than one entire year and to less than two entire years, and if we concede that, as Turnour and others have already conjectured, the total of Aśoka's reign, 37 years, refers only to the number of *completed* years, and leaves out odd months and days, then the two statements will agree perfectly. In order to make my meaning plainer, I will, merely for argument's sake, put down definite figures for the unknown number of months or days, and the agreement of the two statements will appear at once :—

Yrs. m.

- |   |    |   |
|---|----|---|
| (7) The Bodhi-tree planted in Ceylon        |    |   |
| in the 18th year after <i>abhisheka</i> ... | 17 | 7 |
| (8) Asandhimitrâ died in the 12th year      |    |   |
| after that .....                            | 11 | 7 |

	Yrs.	m.
(9) Aśoka married her attendant in the 4th year after that .....	3	3
(10) The Bodhi-tree was destroyed in the 3rd year after that.....	2	4
(11) Aśoka died in the 4th year after that .....	3	1

The total of Aśoka's reign was then... 37 10  
and that is just what the *Mahāvamśa* says, provided its total 37 is taken to refer to completed years only.

The figures assigned for the months are, as I have stated, entirely fictitious, and, as far as the statements of the *Mahāvamśa* are concerned, the surplus over 37 years may be just as well ten days as ten months. But it seems obvious to me that the above interpretation of the passage is more accurate, and more in accordance with the literal meaning of the text than that proposed by the *Tīkā*, which declares it necessary to avoid counting the last year of each period twice.\*

If we now turn to consider the adjustment of Buddha's years and of Aśoka's, we shall again find an element of uncertainty in the statement of the *Mahāvamśa*. But it will also appear that, under certain suppositions which the text by no means disallows, the statements

---

\* Turnour, *Mahāv.*, Introd. p. xlvii.

of the *Mahāvamśa* and of those of the new inscriptions completely agree. The *Mahāvamśa* says, V. 21, that 218 years after the *Nirvāṇa* had passed when Aśoka's *abhisheka* took place. This obviously means, according to our manner of expressing ourselves, that the *abhisheka* was performed in 219 A.B. The text leaves it doubtful if the 218th year had only just closed, or if a number of months had elapsed since its completion. On this point, regarding which, I repeat it, no certainty can be gained from the *Mahāvamśa*, as well as on the other point, which according to the preceding discussion is equally uncertain, the amount of the excess over the total of 37 years, depends the determination of the year of the *Nirvāṇa* in which Aśoka died. If at the time of the *abhisheka* 218 years of the *Nirvāṇa* plus a few months, say two or three only, had elapsed, and if the excess of months over the total of 37 years of Aśoka's reign amounts likewise to a few months, say two or three only, then the death of Aśoka will fall in the year 256 of the *Nirvāṇa*. For 218 years and 2 months + 37 years and 2 months makes 255 years and 4 months. Under this supposition Aśoka died in the first half of the year 256 of the *Nirvāṇa*.

But if many months, say 10 or 11, of the 219th year of the *Nirvāṇa* had passed at the time of the *abhisheka*, and if many months, say ten or eleven, have to be added to the total of the years of Aśoka's reign, then his death falls in

the year 257 after the *Nirvāṇa*. For 218 years and 11 months + 37 years and 11 months makes 256 years and 10 months. It is also apparent that in order to bring about an agreement between the inscriptions and the *Mahāvamśa* this second interpretation has to be adopted. For only in case Aśoka died towards the end of 257 A.B. will it be possible to allow that he may have caused an inscription to be incised *when 256 years after the departure of the Teacher had passed*.

Now only one more point, the probable date of Aśoka's conversion, remains to be considered in order to complete the agreement between the inscriptions and the *Mahāvamśa*. The equation of the former is 33 years 6 months and  $x$  days = 256 A.B. +  $x$  months or days. The *Mahāvamśa* says, V. 34, "The father (of Aśoka), being of the Brahmanical faith, used to feed (daily) sixty thousand Brahmans. He himself did so for *three years*." Now this may mean either that the interval between Aśoka's *abhisheka* and his conversion was filled by three years exactly, or that some months and days have to be added. The equation in the new inscriptions makes it necessary to add at least eight months, because the middle of the thirty-fourth after the conversion could not fall under any other supposition in the 257th year after the *Nirvāṇa*. But if this addition is made the dates of the inscription and of the *Mahāvamśa* agree perfectly. For then we obtain—

Aśoka's *abhisheka* 218 years after the *Nirvāṇa* and say 11 months, *i.e.* at the end of 219 A.B.

Aśoka's conversion 3 years after the *abhisheka* and say 8 months, *i.e.* in the middle of 223 A.B.

Date of the inscriptions 33 years and 6 months and odd days after conversion, *i.e.* in the beginning of 257 A.B.

Death of Aśoka 37 years and say 10 months after *abhisheka*, *i.e.* in the end of 257 A.B.

The agreement which has thus been shown to exist between the inscriptions and the *Mahāvamsā* is, in spite of the uncertainty introduced by the neglect of the odd months in the latter work, sufficiently close to prove that the *Mahāvamsā*'s statements regarding the history of India and of the beginnings of Buddhism are more than fanciful inventions of the monastic mind. They must be regarded as genuine historical dates, derived from contemporary evidence.

The necessary consequence of this discovery is that all attempts to adjust the Ceylonese chronology to that of the Greeks by means of a reduction or of a lengthening of the distance between the *Nirvāṇa* and Aśoka have to be given up. Henceforth it must be accepted as a fact that the *abhisheka* of Aśoka took place in 219 A.B., and that he was alive in the beginning of 257 A.B. If the identification of Aśoka's grandfather Chandragupta with the *Sandrokypotos* of the Greeks, and Aśoka's own

relations to Antiochus, the Antiyoka or Antiyoga of the rock inscriptions, prove that the Ceylonese date of the *Nirvāṇa* 543 B.C. has been placed 60 to 70 years too early, the fault must lie either in the period after Aśoka, or in the adjustment of the dates of the Indian history and of the Ceylonese kings. It is possible that either some kings have been erroneously inserted AFTER *Devānānpriya Tishya*, the contemporary of Aśoka, or that the reigns of Tishya, as well as of his predecessor and successors, have been intentionally expanded. The latter alternative seems to me most likely, because, as Mr. Turnour† and other Orientalists have shown, the dates of Pāṇḍukâbhaya, of Mutaśiva and of his four sons, are extremely suspicious. It seems impossible that these kings, who represent three generations, should have reigned 200 years. This suspicion becomes stronger through other circumstances, especially through the fact that Vijaya's landing is made to fall on the day of the *Nirvāṇa*. I am not prepared to risk any definite statement as to the manner in which the reigns of the Ceylonese kings ought to be reduced, or on the exact amount of the reduction, as I think it very likely that Dr. P. Goldschmidt's collection of Ceylonese inscriptions will completely clear up the question. For all practical purposes

---

† *Mahāv. Introd.* p. xli.



the date for the *Nirvāṇa*, 477-78 A.D., fixed by Professor M. Müller, by General Cunningham, and others, is perfectly sufficient. The new inscriptions show that it cannot be very far wrong. The two outside termini for the beginning of Chandragupta's reign are 321 B.C. on the one side, and 310 B.C. on the other. For this reason, and because the Ceylonese date for the beginning of the Mauryas, 163 A.B., must now be considered to be genuine, the *Nirvāṇa* must fall between 483-82 B.C. and 472-71 B.C. If, therefore, the date 477-78 for the *Nirvāṇa* should eventually be proved to be wrong, the fault cannot be more than five or six years one way or the other.

Certainty regarding the date of the *Nirvāṇa*, as already stated, will probably be obtained from the Ceylonese inscriptions. But there is a chance that the same goal may be reached by a different road. If a perfectly trustworthy account of the interval between Aśoka's death and the beginning of the Vikrama or of the Śaka eras could be obtained either from Indian inscriptions or from books, then the question would also be solved. I must add that an account of this kind exists, though I should be sorry to call it trustworthy on the evidence hitherto adduced. The Śvetāmbara Jainas place Mahāvîra's *nirvāṇa* in 470† before the era of

---

† See *Ind. Ant.* vol. II. p. 362, and *Jour. Bo. Br. R. As. Soc.* vol. IX. p. 147. Kern in his *Jaartelling*, p. 28, gives

Vikramâditya 56-7 B.C., and the beginning of the Mauryas in 216 after Mahâvîra, or in 311 B.C. This date agrees well enough with the statements of the Greeks, and I should be prepared to adopt it if the manner in which the Śvetâmbaras arrived at it agreed with the Buddhist chronology, and the age of the *gāthā* in which it occurs were better authenticated. But the Jaina account of the dynasties in the 6th and 5th centuries B.C. differs from those of the Bauddhas and of the Brahmans. The *gāthā* says that Mahâvîra died on the night in which king Pâlaka of Ujjain was installed on the throne ; that Pâlaka ruled 60 years ; that, next, the Nandas held India for 155 years, and that the latter were succeeded by the Mauryas. Thus the Śiśunâgas are left out altogether—a point which makes the dates suspicious. Under these circumstances I give the Jaina account merely as a curiosity, and in order to warn against its being used, without further inquiry, as a means to find the exact date of Chandragupta's accession and of the *Nirvâṇa*.

---



466 before Vikrama as the date of Mahâvîra's *nirvâṇa*, on the authority of Professor Weber's extracts from the *Sa-trunjayamâhātmya*. That work is a wretched forgery by some *yati* of the 13th or 14th century, as the chapter on Kumârapâla of Anahilapâtaka, 1144-74 A.D., and the numerous *Gujaraticisms* show. The Śvetâmbaras mean the era of Vikramâditya of 56-7 B.C. when they say 470 before Vikrama. The Digambaras place Mahâvîra's *nirvâṇa* in 605 before Vikrama, and refer to the so-called Śaka era.

The additions to the history of the last years of Aśoka which the new inscriptions furnish are of great interest. We now hear for the first time that Aśoka's zeal for the Buddhist faith produced towards the end of his reign something very like bigotry. His boast that he caused the people of Jambudvîpa to abjure their ancient gods, which probably must be taken to mean only that he did his best to bring about such a result, stands in strange contrast to his earlier toleration. § The change finds its explanation partly in the increasing age of the monarch, and the domestic difficulties which, both according to Buddhistic and Jaina accounts, he had with the queen whom he married after Asandhimitrâ's death, and partly by his turning ascetic. This fact is likewise new and of great interest, as Aśoka, in spite of his asceticism, apparently continued to govern the country. It indicates that the Buddhists allowed, just like the Jainas in exceptional cases, an intermediate stage between the *Śrāvakas* or lay brethren and the *Bhikshus* or monks. The Gujarât chroniclers assert that the Chaulukya king Kumârapâla, to whom they even give the title *saṃghādhipati*, 'lord of the Saṃgha,' took at various periods of his reign vows of continence, of temperance, of abstention from animal food, and of *apratigraha*, i.e. to re-

---

§ See Lassen, *Ind. Alt.* vol. II. p. 275, 2nd ed.

nounce the confiscation of the heirless property of Vâniâs. I am not aware that other instances of royal Bauddha ascetics occur who continued to administer the affairs of their kingdoms.

There is yet another question for which the new inscriptions are of the utmost importance,—the history of the ancient Nâgarî numerals. Hitherto the oldest inscriptions showing them were the Mathurâ inscriptions of Kanishka, the Śâtavâhana inscriptions on the Nânâghât, and the inscriptions of the Andhrabhṛityas. It is satisfactory to find now that these numeral signs are contemporaneous with the oldest known form of the Indian alphabet. But the form of the sign for 200 is still more important, as it furnishes the clearest proof for the correctness of Pandit Bhagvânâlâl Indrajî's discovery of the syllabic origin of the Nâgarî numerals. The sign for 200 employed in the Sahasrâm edict is , and, if the right-hand side-stroke denoting the second hundred is left out of consideration, closely resembles the sign for 100 in the Nânâghât inscriptions and the fifth Gupta sign.|| But in the Rûpnâth edict the common sign for the syllable *su*  appears in its stead, showing, however, an unusual elongation of the left-hand vertical stroke. It is obvious that the elongation of the vertical


---

|| *Ind. Ant.* vol. VI. p. 45, col. 1 and col. 5.

stroke serves ¶ here the same purpose as the side-stroke in the Sahasrām figure, *i. e.* to denote that 200, not 100, must be read. But the fact that the common sign for the syllable *su* is employed, instead of the differentiated form used in the Sahasrām edict, proves that the engraver knew it to be a syllable, and pronounced it as such.

I take this opportunity to give an attempt at an explanation of the very curious fact that in the syllabic notation of numerals 200 is expressed by the syllable *su* or *śu* plus one stroke, and 300 by *su* or *śu* plus two strokes, which latter are attached, according to the fancy of the writer, either at the right-hand side both high up and low down, or even placed at the top. This manner of notation is not easily explicable on the supposition that the side-strokes represent *ankas* or figures. For in that case we ought to find two side-strokes for 200, and three for 300. I propose, therefore, to take them as marks intended to show that in the case of 200 the syllable *su* had to be pronounced long, *sū*, and in the case of 300 *pluta*, *i. e.* *sū-u*. This explanation holds good for the Andhrabhṛitya and Vākātaka signs for 1,000, 2,000, and 3,000 also, which may be read *dhu*, *dhū*, and *dhū-u*, respectively. It is confirmed by the fact that

---

¶ In the case of 300 the Jainas also place the second stroke above the syllable, and write .

in the case of 400 the sign for the syllable expressing 4, *ḥhka* or *ki* according to Bhagvânâlâl, is attached to *su*. The Hindu grammarians allow syllables of three *mâtrâs* only, and it was therefore impossible to employ an additional-stroke in order to denote 400.

The sign in the two edicts for 50 also deserves attention. Rûpnâth shows the form used in the Kshatrapa and Valabhî inscriptions, while Sahasrâm gives that of the Eastern plates and of the MSS.

*Transcript and Restoration of the Sahasrâm Edict.\**

Devânâm piye hevaṁ â[hâ sâtilekâni adhit]i-  
yâni savachhalâni, | aṁ upâsake sumi, | na cha  
bâdham palakamte.—1—

Saviṁchhale sâdhike | , aṁ [sumi bâdham pala-  
kam]t[e]. [hakâ

Etena cha aṁtalena | jambudîpasi aṁmisam,  
devâ[hu]sam, ta—2—

---

\* Materials used : Plate XIV. of General Cunningham's *Corp. Inscr. Ind.* vol. I. and a photograph supplied by General Cunningham.

L. 1. The facsimile and photograph show that seven or eight syllables have been lost. The restoration of the first six is absolutely certain on account of the identical readings of *R.* and *B.* [aḍhit]iyâni is less certain. I take it for a representative of *adhitisâni*, caused by the change of *s* to *h* and its subsequent loss, just as in Panjâbî *tîh*, thirty, and *ikattî*, thirty-one.

L. 2. Read *sahvachhale*, *R.* Six or seven letters have been lost. *R.* and *B.* have two sentences, corresponding to this lacuna, containing sixteen letters. *S.* can have had

munisâ | misam̐ deva katâ. | Pala[kamasi hi]  
iyam̐ phale [n]o [cha i]yam̐ mahatatâ-vacha-  
kiye pâvatave. | Khudakena hi pala—3—

kamamînenâ vipule suag[e] [sa]kiye âlâ[dha  
yita]v[e]. | Se etâye aṭhâye iyam̐ sâvâne | :  
khudakâ cha udâlâ cha pa—4—

lakamaṁtu, am̐tâ pi cham̐ jânam̐tu | ; chila-  
ṭhitîke cha palakame hotu |. Iyam̐ cha aṭhe  
vaḍhisati |, vipulam̐ pi cha vaḍhisati,—5—

diyâḍhiyam̐ avaladhiyenâ diyadhiyam̐ vaḍhi-  
sati | Iyam̐ cha savane vivuthena ; duve sapaṁ-  
nâlâti- —6—

satâ vivuthâ ti (sû ñ phra) 256. Ima cha aṭham̐  
pavatesu likhâpayâ thâya ; [yata] vâ a- —7—

thi hete silâthambhâ tata pi likhâpayâ tha-  
yi.—8—

one sentence only. The sense requires the sentence given above. Read *amisan*, according to *R.* Read *devâ-husam̐* as *R.* has *devâ-husu* and a verb is required. The vertical stroke in the facsimile is the left-hand part of the *ḷ*. This emendation I owe to Paṇḍit Bhagvānlâl Indrajî. Read *te* for *ta*, according to *R.*

L. 3. Read *devâ*. The *pala* before the lacuna is probable from the photograph. The restoration is certain on account of the corresponding passage in *R.*, which here, as everywhere, substitutes the root *palam̐* for *palakam̐*. The second and third lacunas have been filled in according to *R.*

L. 4. Restorations according to *R.* and *B.*—Read *sâvane*.

L. 5. Read *cha jânam̐tu*.

L. 6. Read *sâvane* ; the facsimile has *dute*, but according to the photograph *duve*, which the sense requires, is at least probable, if not certain.

L. 7. Restoration suggested by the fact that two syllables have been lost, and a relative pronoun is desirable, though not absolutely necessary.

*Translation.*

The Beloved of the gods speaketh thus : (*It is*) [*more than thirty-two*] years [*and a half*] that I am a worshipper (*of Buddha*), and I have not exerted myself strenuously. (*It is*) a year and more [*that I have exerted myself strenuously*]. During this interval those gods that were (*held to be*) true gods in Jambudvîpa have been made (*to be regarded as*) men† and false. For through strenuous exertion comes this reward, and it ought not to be said to be an effect of (*my*) greatness. For even a small man who exerts himself can gain for himself great rewards in heaven. Just for this purpose a sermon has been preached : “Both small ones and great ones should exert themselves, and in the end they should also obtain (*true*) knowledge. And this spiritual good will increase ; it will even increase exceedingly ; it will increase one (*size*) and a half, at least one (*size*) and a half.” And this sermon (*is*) by the *Departed*. Two hundred (*years*) exceeded by fifty-six, 256, have passed since ; and I have caused this matter to be incised on the hills ; or where those stone pillars are, there too I have caused it to be incised.

---

† This phrase probably alludes to the Buddhist belief that the *devas* also have shorter or longer terms of existence, after which they die and are born again in other stages of existence according to their *karma*.



*Transcript of the Rūpnāth Edict.†*

Devânām piye hevaṃ āhā : sâtirakekāni  
adhitisāni va[sā], ya sumi pākā sa[va]ki, no  
cha bādhi pakate. Sâtileke chu chhavachhare,  
ya sumi haka saṃgha-papite—1—

bādhi cha pakate. Yi imāya kâlāya jambudipasi  
amisā devā-husu te dāni masā kaṭā. Pakamasi  
hi esa phale, no cha esā mahatatâpâ-potave.  
Khudakenā hi ka—2—

pi parumaminenā sakiye pipule pi svage  
ârodhave. Etiya athāya cha sâvane kaṭe;  
khudakā cha udâlā cha pakamaṃtu ti, atâ pi cha  
jānaṃtu. Iyaṃ pakāre cha—3—

kiti? chirathitike siyâ. Iya hi aṭhe vadhi  
vadhisiti, vipula cha vadhisiti, apaladhiyenā  
diyadhiyaṃ vadhisati. Iya cha aṭhe pavatisu  
lekhâpeta vâlata hadha cha; aṭhi—4—

silâṭhubhe silâṭhambhasi lâkhâpeta vayata.  
Etinā cha vayajanenā yāvatakatu paka ahâle,

† Materials used: two rubbings forwarded by General Cunningham.

L. 1. Read *sâtilekāni*, the letter **𑀓** looks blurred and is a mistake for **𑀔**. For *pākā* read *hakā*. There is a faint mark between *sa* and *ki* which may be *va*,—*sāvaki* is required as synonym for *upāsake*; *saṃgha ushite* is a possible reading, as the letters appear to be half effaced. The reading given above is supported by B.

L. 2. Under the *vā* of *devā-husa* there is a vertical stroke, resembling an *u* **𑀕**. Probably it is intended to indicate the absorption of the initial *a* of *chusu*, and is the oldest form of the *Avagraha* S. Read *esa* for *esā*. A letter may have stood between *khuda/enā hi* and *ka*. But I rather think the marks in the impression are accidental scratches.

L. 3. Read *pakamaminenā*; *pipule*; *ârâdhave*; the long *ā* in *pakāre* is not quite certain.

savara-vivase tavâyati. Vyuthenâ sâvane kate,  
 (sû ñ phra) 256 sa—5—  
 ta-vivâsâ ta—6—

*Translation.*

The Beloved of the gods speaketh thus :  
 (*It is*) more than thirty-two years and a half  
 that I am a hearer (*of the law*), and I did not  
 exert myself strenuously. But it is a year and  
 more that I have entered the community (*of*  
*ascetics*), and that I have exerted myself  
 strenuously. Those gods who during this time  
 were considered to be true (*gods*) in Jambudvîpa,  
 have now been abjured. For through exertion  
 (*comes*) this reward, and it cannot be obtained  
 by greatness. For a small (*man*) who exerts  
 himself somewhat can gain for himself great  
 heavenly bliss. And for this purpose this ser-  
 mon has been preached : “Both great ones and  
 small ones should exert themselves, and should in  
 the end gain (*true*) knowledge, and this manner  
 (*of acting*) should be, what ? Of long duration.  
 For this spiritual good will grow the growth,  
 and will grow exceedingly, at the least it will  
 grow one (*size*) and a half.” And this matter  
 has been caused to be written on the hills ;  
 (*where*) a stone pillar is, (*there*) it has been

---

L. 5. Read *lekhâpeta thâyi ti ; tapayati* 6 for 8 ; but  
 possibly the reading on the stone may be *tapâyati*, as the  
 lower part of *vâ* does not quite form a circle. Possibly  
*vyâthenâ*.

L. 6. Probably *ti* for *ta* to be read.

written on a stone pillar. And as often as (*man brings*) to this writing ripe thought, (*so often*) will he rejoice, (*learning to*) subdue his senses. § This sermon has been preached by the *Departed*. 256 (*years have elapsed*) since the departure of the *Teacher*.

*Transcript of the Bairât Edict.*||

Devânam piye âhâ sâti[lekâni] . . . . .  
 i.e. sa . . . . —1—  
 vasâ-nam ya haka upâsake n[o] cha bâdham.  
 . . . . . —2—  
 am mamayâ samghe papayite [bâ]dha[m] cha.  
 . . . . . —3—  
 jambudîpasi amisâ-nam deva-hi . . . vi . . . .  
 [pala]kamasi esa[pha]le—4—  
 (n)o hi ese mahatane vachakaye . . . . .

§ The original has a double meaning. The other meaning is, "And as often as (*a man seasons his*) boiled rice with this condiment he will be satisfied, falling into a state of *samvara*, i.e. that state of intense satisfaction and repletion in which he closes his eyes from pleasure, and suspends the activity of the senses generally.

|| Materials used : Cunningham, *Corp. Inscr.* vol. I. plate XIV., and a cloth copy made by Pandit Bhagvânâlâl Indrajî.

L. 1. Cloth copy; *devânâm*. The remnants of three letters towards the end of the line are also from the latter.

L. 2. *Corp. Inscr.* : *paka*. Cloth copy shows lower part of *n(o)*. *Corp. Inscr.* : *bâdhi*. Cloth copy has remnants of these letters towards the end of the line.

L. 3. *Corp. Inscr.* : *payaye ate* and *bâdhi*. In the cloth copy the top of *dha* is wanting.

L. 4. Cloth copy : *amisâ-na deve pi* and omits *vi*. I conjecture *amisâ-nam deva-ki[su te dâ]ni*. Portions of the letters *laka* appear on the cloth copy; *Corp. Inscr.* : *masi*.

. . . . . [pala]rumamimenâ ya . . . . .  
 pa—5—  
 vipule pi śvaṃge [sa]kye âlâdheta(v)e . . . .  
 . . . . . [khuda]kâ cha udâlâ cha  
 palakamatu ti—6—  
 aṃte pi janāntu ti chilathiti[ke] . . . . .  
 [vi]pulaṃ pi vadhisati—7—  
 diyadhiyaṃ vadhisati (ñ phra) 56 . . . . .  
 . . . . . —8—

*Index of Words occurring in the three Edicts.*¶

*A m*, S. 1, 2; B. 3 = Sansk. *yat*: compare Dhau-  
 li VI. 3, 5; sep. ed. I. 2, &c.

*A t h a m*, S. 7; *a t h d y a*, S. 5, R. 4, *a t h e*; S. 5,  
 R. = Sansk. *artha*, Pali *a t t h o*: compare Dhau li IV.  
 7, V. 7, &c. and pillar edicts.

*A t h i*, R. 4 = Sansk. *asti*: compare Dhau li IX.  
 1, &c.

L. 5. *Corp. Inscr.* begins the line *ha hi*, the cloth copy shows o clearly. *Corp. Inscr.*: *mapâtine*. I think *maha-tana* should be read, as the word forms a compound with *vachakaye*. Read [palī]kamaminenâ. The cloth copy omits *ya* . . . . . *pa*, which are not easily explained.

L. 6. Cloth copy: *vipule him śvage takye*; *Corp. Inscr.*: *vipule pi śvaṃge kiye*. The above reading is conjectural, but supported by the analogy of *S.* and *R.* Possibly *sakiye* may be the right form. Towards the end *Corp. Inscr.* reads [khuda]kâ che, which is incorrect.

L. 7. Cloth copy omits *aṃ(te)*, shows half a *ta* instead of *ti* in *chilathiti(ke)*, and omits *pu* in *(vi)pulaṃ*.

L. 8. Cloth copy: *diyadhiya. vadhisati*, and omits the numeral signs. I must confess that I doubt the correctness of the latter, on account of their position.

¶ The references to the published edicts refer to Mr. Burgess's *Girnar facsimiles*, and to the plates of General Cunningham's *Corp. Inscript. Ind.* vol. I., which he has kindly forwarded to me.

[*Aḍhit*]*i y ḍ ni*, S. 1, a vicarious form for the following = \**aḍhitihāni*; compare Panjâbî *tīh*, thirty, and *ikattī*, thirty-one, *bīh*, twenty, and *panjī*, twenty-five, &c.

*Aḍhitis ḍ ni*, S. 1 = Sansk. *ardhadvi-trimsāni*, Gujarāṭi *adhitts*: compare also *aḍha*-(*kosikyḍni*), Delhi sep. ed. 2. Regarding Sansk. *ardha* = *sār-dha* see *Pet. Dict.* s. v. *ardha*. *Aḍhi* or closely allied forms occur in all the modern Prakrits.

*A t ḍ*, R. 3 = *amtḍ* = Sansk. *amtāt*.

*A t hi*, S. 7 = Sansk. *asti* with the meaning of the plural *santi*: compare Childers' *Pali Dict.* s.v. *atthi*, and Delhi sep. ed. 11, *ata athi silāthambhāni*.

*A m t a l e n a*, S. 2. = Sansk. *antareṇa*: compare Dhauli, e.g. IV. 1, and pillar edicts.

*A m t ḍ*, S. 5 = Sansk. *antāt*.

*A m t e*, B. 7 = Sansk. *ante*.

*A p a l a ḍ h i y e n ḍ*, R. 4 = Sansk. *aparārdhyena*.

*A m i s ḍ*, R. 2 = Sansk. *amishāt*.

*A m i s ḍ - n a m*, B. 4 = *amishāt + nanu*.

*A m m i s a m*, S. 3, mistake or vicarious form for *amisaṃ* = Sansk. *amisham*: compare, regarding nasalization, Kuhn, *Beiträge Pali Gram.* p. 33, and Dhauli II. 3. *Amni* = *ḍni* = *yḍni*, &c.

*A v a l a ḍ h i y e n ḍ*, S. 6 = Sansk. *avarārdhyena*.

*A h ḍ l e*, R. 5 = Pali *āhāro*: see Childers' *Dict.* s. v. For the change in the quantity of the initial *ḍ* compare Kuhn, *loc. cit.* pp. 29-30, Dhauli IX. 1, *abādhesu* = *ābādhesu*, &c.

*A h u s a m*, *ahusu*: see *husaṃ*, *husu*.

*Ā r o d h a v e*, R. 3, mistake for *ārādhave* = Sansk. *ārāddhavyaḥ*: compare Gīrnār VI. 12. -*Tave*, i.e. *tarve* = Sansk. *tavyaḥ*, occurs in the pillar edicts.

*Ālā* (*d h a y i t a*)*v*(*e*), *ālādheta*, S. 4, B. 6 : see the preceding, and compare Dhauri IX. 7, &c.

*Āhā*, S. 1, K. 1, B. 1 = Sansk. *āha*.

*Ima*, S. 7 = *imam* = Sansk. *imam*.

*Imāya*, R. 2 = Sansk. *asmai* : compare Girnār III. 3.

*Iya*, R. 4 = *iyam*.

*Iya m*, S. 3, 5, 6; R. 3 = Sansk. *ayam* and *idam* : compare Khālsī XII. 13, *iyam mule*; Delhi III. 17, *iyam kayāne*, &c.

*Uḍālā*, S. 3, R. 3, B. 6 = Sansk. *uddrāḥ*, Pali *ulārā*.

*Upāsake*, S. 1, B. 2 = Sansk. *upāsakaḥ*, Pali *upāsako*.

*Etāye*, S. 4 = Sansk. *etasmai*; compare Girnār III. 3, &c.

*Etinā*, R. 5 = Sansk. *etena*.

*Etiya*, R. 3 = *etāye*.

*Etena*, S. 2 = Sansk. *etena*.

*Esa*, R. 2, B. 4 = Sansk. *esha*, Pali *esa* : compare Dhauri sep. ed. I. 2, &c.

*Eśā*, R. 2, probably a mistake for *esa* or *ese*.

*Ese*, B. 5 = Sansk. *esha*, Pali *eso*, Māgadhi *ése*.

*Katā*, S. 3, R. 2 = Sansk. *kṛitāḥ* : Pali *kaṭā*; compare Dhauri V. 3, &c.

*Katē*, R. 3, 5 = Sansk. *kṛitam* (neuter) : compare Dhauri V. 1, &c.

-*Katv*, in *yāvata-katv*, R. 5 = Sansk. *kṛitvaḥ* and Pali *khattum*.

*Kapi*, R. 2, 3 = Sansk., Pali, *kimapi*,—possibly a mistake for *kipi*.

*Kālāya*, R. 2 = *kālāya* with sense of *kāle*.

*Kiti*, R. 4 = Sansk. *kimiti*, Pali *kimiti*; rock edicts usually *kimiti*, but Khālsī N. face XIII. 12 *kiti*.

*Khudakā*, S. 4, R. 3, B. 6 = Sansk. *kshudrakāḥ*, Pali *khuddakā*.

*Khudakena*, S. 3, -*kenā*, R. 2 = Sansk. *kshudrakena*.

*Chā*, S. 1, 2, 4, 5, 6, 7; R. 1, 2, 3, 4, 5; B. 3, 6 = Sansk. and Pali *cha*.

*Chām*, S., mistake for *cha*.

*Chā*, B. 6, mistake for *cha*.

*Chirathitike*, R. 4 = Sansk. *chirasthitikāḥ*, Pali *chirattitiko*.

*Chilathitike*, S. 5; see the preceding: compare Dhauḷi V. 8, VI. 6.

*Chilathiti(ke)*, B. 7; see the preceding.

*Chu*, R. 1 = Sansk. *tu*: compare Dhauḷi VI. 7, sep. ed. I. 10.

*Chhava chhare*, R. 1 = Sansk. *saṃvatsarah*, possibly a mistake for *sava*°; but compare *kāchhati* = \**kassati* = Sansk. *karishyati*, in the pillar edicts.

*Janāntu*, B. 7; probably a mistake for *jānāntu*.

*Jambudipasi*, R. 2, B. 4 = Sansk. *jambudvīpe*, Pali *jambudīpe*.

*Jāmbudīpasi*, S. 2; see the preceding.

*Jānāntu*, S. 5, R. 4 = Sansk., Pali, *jānāntu*.

*-Thiti*, S. 5, R. 4 (in *chila-thitike*) = Sansk. *sthiti*, Pali *thiti*.

*Ta*, S. 2, mistake or vicarious form for *te*, which see.

*Ta*, R. 6, for *ti* = Sansk. *iti*.

*Ta ta*, S. 8 = Sansk. *tatra*, Pali *tattha*: compare Delhi sep. ed. 3, &c.

*Ta vāyati*, R. 5; probably a mistake for *tapa-yati* = Sansk. *tarpayati*, Pali *tappeti*.

*Ti*, S. 7, R. 3, B. 6, 7 = Sansk. *iti*, Pali *ti*.

*Te*, R. 2 = Sansk., Pali, *te* (nom. pl. m. of *tad*).

*Thayi*, S. 8, probably for *athāyīm* = Sansk. *asthām* (1st per. sing. aor. act. of *sthā*).

*Thāya*, S. 8, a variant of the preceding.

*Dāni*, R. 2 = Sansk. *idāntm*, Pali *dāni*.

*Diyaḍhiyaṁ*, S. 6, R. 4, B. 8 = Sansk. *dvyar-dham*, Pali *diyaddham*: compare *diyaddha*, Khâlî XIII. 35.

*Diyaḍhiyaṁ*, S. 6; a vicarious form for the preceding.

*Duve* = Sansk. *dve*, Pali *duve*.

*Devā*, S. 3, B. 4, probably mistake for *devā*.

*Devā*, S. 3, R. 2 = Sansk. *devāh*.

*Devānaṁ*, B. 1 = Sansk. *devānām*, Pali *devānaṁ*.

*Devānāṁ*, S. 1, R. 1, a mistake or variant for the preceding.

*Na*, S. 1 = Sansk., Pali, *na*.

*Naṁ*, B. 2 (in *vasā-naṁ*), B. 4 (in *amisa-naṁ*) = Sansk. *nanu*, Śaur., Mâg., *ṇaṁ*, Hemach. IV. 283, 302, ed. Pischel.

*No*, S. 1, 3, R. 1, 2, B. 2, 5 = Sansk., Pali, *no*: compare Dhauti V. 3, &c.

*Pakā*, R. 5 = Sansk. *pakvāh*, Pali *pakko*.

*Pakāte*, R. 1, 2 = Sansk. *prakrāntāh*, Pali *pakkanto*, but with the meaning of *parākṛānta*.

*Pakāmaṁtu*, R. 3 = Sansk. *prakrāmantu*, Pali *pakkamantu*.

*Pakāmasi*, R. 2 = Sansk. *prakrame*.

*Pakāre*, R. 3 = Sansk. *prakārah*, Pali *pakāro*, but possibly a mistake for *pakame*.

*Papāye* or *papayite*, B. 3 = Sansk. *prāpitāh*.

*-Papāite*, R. 1 (in *saṁgha-pa*) = Sansk. *prāptāh*.



*Parumaminendā*, R. 3, mistake for *pakama-minendā* = Sansk. *prakramamānena*.

*Palakamte*, S. 1, 2 = Sansk. *parākrāntah*, Pali *parakkanto*.

*Palakamatu*, B. 6, a variant of the following.

*Palakamantu*, S. 5 = Sansk. *parākrāmantu*, Pali *parakkāmantu*: compare also Dhauli VI. 6, &c.

*Palakamāmnendā*, S. 3, 4 = Sansk. *parākramamānena*: for the termination *-māna* compare *sampatāpādayamāne*, Dhauli sep. ed. I. 15.

*Palakamasi*, S. 3, B. 4 = Sansk. *parākrame*.

*Palakame*, S. 5 = Sansk. *parākramah*: compare Dhauli VI. 7.

*Palarumaminendā*, B. 4, 5, a mistake for *palakamaminendā*.

*Pavatisu*, R. 4, a *varia lectio* for the following.

*Pavatesu*, S. 7 = Sansk. *parvateshu*, Pali *pabatesu*.

*Pākā*, R. 1, a mistake for *hakā*.

*Pāpotave*, R. 2 (in *mahatātāpā*) = Sansk. *prāptavyam*, but formed from a new root, *pāpo*: compare Pali *pappoti*, and *pāpovā*, Delhi VI. 3.

*Pāvātave*, S. 3 = Sansk. *pravaktavyam*: for the lengthening of the first syllable compare Pali *pāvachanam*.

*Pi*, S. 5, 8, R. 3, B. 6 = Sansk. *api*, Pali *pi*.

*Pipule*, R. 3, a mistake for *vipule*.

*Piye*, S. 1, R. 1, B. 1 = Sansk. *priyah*, Pali *piyo*.

*Phale*, S. 3, R. 2, B. 4 = Sansk. *phalam*, or possibly = *phalah*, a rare form for *phalam*: vide the *Pet. Dict.* s. v. *Phalāni* occurs Khālsī II. 6.

*Bādham*, S. 1, B. 2, 3 = Sansk. *bāḥam*: compare rock edicts VII., end.

*Bāḍhi*, R. 1, 2, B. 2, 3 (?), a vicarious form for the preceding. For *am* = *e* = *i*, compare also Delhi V. 8, *sūkali*.

*Mayā*, B. 3 = Sansk. *mayā*: compare Dhauli VI. 1, Delhi sep. ed. 3.

*Mas*, R. 2 = *mis* = Sansk. *mishāt*.

*Mahatatā*, S. 3, R. 2 = Sansk. *mahattā*, Pali *mahantatā*.

*Mahatane*, B. 5 = Sansk. *mahattvam*, Prāk. *mahattanam*: compare Var. IV. 22.

*Misam*, S. 3 = Sansk. *misham*. For the meaning of *misham kri* see *Pet. Dict.* s. v. *misha*.

*Munisā*, S. 3 = Sansk. *manushyāḥ*: compare Dhauli II. 3, &c.

*Ya*, R. 1, B. 2 = Sansk. *yat*, Pali *yam*.

*Yāvatakātu*, R. 5 = Sansk. *yāvatkṛitāḥ*.

*Yi*, R. 2 = Sansk., Pali, *ye* (nom. pl. m. of *yad*).

*Lākhāpeta*, R. 5, a mistake for *lekhāpeta*.

*Likhāpaya*, -*yā*, S. 7, 8 = Sansk. *lekhitvā*; -*aya* = *ya*; compare Pali *likhāpeti*, and for the construction of *thā* with the absolutive, Childers' *Dict.* s. v. *tiṭṭhati*, *thāti*.

*Lekhāpeta*, R. 4 = Sansk. *lekhitaḥ*: compare Dhauli II. 3, *lopabeta* and *lopapita* = Sansk. *ropitāni*.

*Vāḍhi*, R. 4 = *vṛiddhim* (acc. sing.), Pali *vāḍhim*.

*Vāchakaye*, B. 5, -*kiye*, S. 3 (in *mahatatāva*<sup>o</sup>) = Sansk. *vāchaka* enlarged by the affix *īya* (?).

*Vāḍhisati*, S. 5, 6, R. 4, B. 7, 8 = Pali *vāḍhissati*: compare pillar edicts, e.g. Delhi I. 6, &c.

*Vāḍhisiti*, R. 4, a vicarious form for the preceding.

*Vayajanenā*, R. 5 = Sansk., Pali. *vyanja-*

*nena* : see Childers' *Dict.* s. v. See also rock edicts III., end. As to *i* represented by *a*, see Kuhn, *loc. cit.* p. 24, and compare Khâlsî XIII. 38, *vaydsanam* = *vyasanam*.

*V a y a t a*, R. 5,—probably a mistake for *thāyi ta* = *asthāyi (sthitah) iti*.

*V a (s ā)*, R. 1. = Sansk. *varshāni*.

*V a s ā-n a m*, B. 2 = Sansk. *varshāni nanu* : compare above, *nam*.

*V ā*, S. 7 = Sansk., Pali, *vā*.

*V ā l a t a*, R. 4, possibly a mistake for *pālata*, but = Sansk. *paratra* : compare pillar edict *pālatam* = *pādratrikam*.

*V i p u l a*, R. 4 = Sansk., Pali, *vipulam*.

*V i p u l a m*, S. 5, B. 8 = Sansk. *vipulam*.

*V i p u l e*, S. 4, B. 6 = Sansk. *vipulāḥ* : compare also *pipule*, and rock edicts VII.

*V i v a s e*, R. 5 (in *savaravi*<sup>o</sup>) = Pali *vivaso*, Sansk. *vivaśah*.

*V i v ā s ā*, R. 6 (in *satavi*<sup>o</sup>) = Sansk. *vivāśāt*.

*V i v u t h ā*, S. 7 = Sansk. *vivṛittāni*, Pali part. of *vattati*, is sometimes *vutto* : compare also Khandagiri inscr. 1. 5, *Jour. Beng. Br. R. As. Soc.* vol. VI. p. 1050, *tatho vase viruthe*.

*V i v u t h e n a*, S. 7 = Sansk. *vivṛittena*.

*V y u t h e n ā*, R. 5, a vicarious form for the preceding, caused by the substitution of *u* for *vu*.

*Ś v a m g e, śvage*, B. 6 = Sansk. *svargah*. Similar substitutions of *ś* for *s* occur particularly often in the latter half of the Khâlsî edicts, e.g. XI. 129 *śo* for *so*, XI. 30 *mitāśamthutāna* = *mitrasamstutāndm*, XII. 34, *śiyā* = *siyā* = *syāt*, &c.

*S a v a c h h a l ā n i*, S. 1 = Sansk. *saṃvatsarāḥ* : compare also *chhavachharā* and *savinichhale*.

*S a k i y e*, -*kye*, S. 4, R. 3, B. 6 = Sansk. *svakīyaḥ*,  
Pali *sakiyo*.

*S a ṁ g h a*, R. 1, -*ghe*, B. 3 = Sansk. *saṁghaḥ*,  
Pali, *saṁgho*.

*S a t a v i v ā s ā*, R. 5, 6 = Sansk. *śāstrivivāśāt*,  
Pali *satthuvivāśā*.

-*Satā*, S. 7 = Sansk. *śatāni*.

*S a p a ṁ ṇ ḍ ā t i s a t ā*, S. 7 = Sansk. *śatpan-  
chāśadatiśatāni*. For *sa* = *śat*: compare *saḍu-  
(vīsati)* in the pillar edicts. For the use of *ati* =  
*adhi* compare *atiratha*, *rājātirāja*, &c.

The *la* of *paṁṇāla* is inexplicable, and one feels  
tempted to read *paṁṇāha* instead, ് for ്.

*S a (v a) k i*, R. 1 = Sansk. *śrāvakaḥ*, Pali *sāvako*.

*S a v a r a*, R. 5 = Sansk., Pali, *saṁvara*.

*S a v a n e*, S. 6, a mistake for *sāvane*.

*S a v i ṁ c h h a l e*, a mistake for *saṁvachhale*.

*S ā t i r a k e k ā n i*, R. 1, a mistake for *śātilekāni*.

*S a t i l e k e*, R. 1 = Sansk. *śātirekaḥ*, Pali *śāti-  
reko*.

*S ā d d h i k e*, S. 2 = Sansk. *śādhikāḥ*.

*S ā v a n e*, R. 3, 5 = Sansk. *śrāvaṇam*, Pali *sāva-  
naṁ*: compare Delhi VII. 20.

*S ā v ā n e*, S. 4, a mistake for the preceding.

*S i y ā*, R. 4 = Sansk. *syāt*: compare Gir. III. 3,  
&c.

*S i l ā t h a ṁ b h a s i*, R. 5 = Sansk. *śīlāstambhe*.

*S i l ā t h u b h e*, R. 5 = Sansk. *śīlāsthambhaḥ*.

*S i l ā t h a ṁ b h ā*, S. 8 = Sansk. *śīlāstambhāḥ*:  
compare *śīlāthambhāni*, Delhi sep. ed. 11.

*S u a g (e)*, S. 4 = Sansk. *svargah*.

*S u m i*, S. 1, R. 1. = Sansk. *asmi* (1st per. sing.  
pres. of *as*): for the insertion of *u* compare Kuhn,  
*Beit. Pali Gram.* p. 45.

*Se*, S. 4 = Pali *se* : compare Dhauli IV. 1, VI. 1, Delhi II. 16, R. 2, &c.

*Svage*, R. 3 = Sansk. *svargah*.

*Haka*, R. 1, B. 2 = Sansk. *aham*, Māgadhi, *hage* : compare also *pkā*, and Dhauli VI. 5 and *passim*.

*Hadhā*, R. 4 = Sansk. *iha*, Pali *hidha* : compare pillar edicts, e.g. Delhi I. 3, *hida-ta*.

*Hi*, S. 3, R. 2, B. 5 = Sansk., Pali, *hi*.

-*Husu*, (*hu*)*saṃ*, R. 2, S. 2 = *abhūvan* : compare *a-humsu*, and *husa*, Delhi VII. 12.

*Hete*, S. 8 = Sansk., Pali, *ete* (nom. m. of *etad*).

*Hevaṃ*, S. 1, R. 1, B. 1 = Sansk., Pali, *evam* : compare Dhauli VI. 4 and *passim*.

*Hotu*, S. 5 = Sansk. *bhavatu* : compare Dhauli V. 8, &c.



- 1 ሐወልታቸው
- 2 ሆኖታልሁ
- 3 ለእነዚህ
- 4 ለእነዚህ
- 5 ለእነዚህ
- 6 ለእነዚህ
- 7 ለእነዚህ
- 8 ለእነዚህ



